BX
7731
.M6

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.
Chap. BX7731
Shelf .M6
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

A LETTER

TO

WILLIAM PENN Esq.

CONCERNING

BAPTISM AND THE LORDS SUPPER,

AND SOME

USAGES OF THE QUAKERS;

BY THE LEARNED AND PIOUS

HENRY MOORE D. D.

FIRST PUBLISHED IN LONDON, A. D. 1710

PHILADELPHIA,

REPUBLISHED BY S. POTTER & Co.

No. 55 CHESNUT STREET, SOLD ALSO BY T. & J. SWORDS

NEW-YORK, & E. J. COALE BALTIMORE.

1819.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS U. S. A.

BX7731
.M6

ADVERTISEMENT.

The writer of the following letter was one of those extraordinary Men, whom a kind Providence occasionally lends to the world in order to surprise, instruct and edify mankind. An account of him in Rees's Cyclopædia contains the principal points of his history: but a volume would be required, to detail the qualities of the gigantic mind, the Christian attainments, and seraphic devotion of this wonderful man: during a long life, his conversation was truly in Heaven: and if we credit the history of his life written by an intimate friend, and exemplary Clergyman, he was indulged in a singular foretase of the spiritual and future world, while labouring with incessant zeal for the eternal welfare of his fellow creatures in this.

PREFACE.

The object of publishing the following Letter at this time may, we hope, be justified on the simple ground, that truth is precious: *and we believe, that* correct knowledge *among Christians, of each others faith and practice in Church rituals, would scatter many prejudices; increase charity. the true badge of discipleship; enlarge the hearts of many, and eventually promote the spread of the holy Gospel among infidels and heathen nations. Such views certainly ought to preponderate on so important a subject, and influence us to conquer all pride of opinion, to measure every thing by the standard of the divine word, and consider the great importance of "forbearing one with another" and "keeping the unity of the spirit, in the bond of peace."*

The history of the sixteenth Century is a striking evidence of the love of God to his Church, when He "broke in pieces the gates of brass, and cut in sunder the bars of iron:" that it was not a particular form of Church practice, nor yet the force of any human system, which effected this stupendous revolution in Christendom; the numerous controversies which have existed, even previously to that time down to the present, on these matters, sufficiently prove; and that it was nothing less than the pure Spirit which searcheth "even the deep things of God" and which was and is, blessed be God, exhibited in his written word, which purged away the dross and caused light to shine out of darkness at that period. It is this Spirit alone, which can now preserve and increase that pure and rational piety among men, which is the true foundation of all substantial happiness, either individual or social.

Doctor More's letter to William Penn, clearly disproves what many upright persons, (but whose reading beyond the scripture is confined chiefly to the religious writings and

histories of the Quakers,) believe to be facts, namely, that the generality of religions professors in the Episcopal Church were persecutors of that sect, from motives of worldly interest or religious bigotry, than which, nothing is more contrary to truth: we unfeignedly desire to avoid any useless remarks on the events of those times, but truth, particularly in religious matters and conduct, always compensates richly an industrious search; and as a constellation of Worthies at that eventful æra in the Church, were regarding the Quakers with a christian concern, rejoicing with the author of the following Letter, in every thing that evinced an enlightened understanding and Spiritual religion among them; it was then, and yet continues to be, a subject of sincere regret with many, that they seem to take a determined stand in several peculiarities, which we cannot but believe *have operated,* and must forever operate, *to prevent all attainments in the Christian race beyond a limited point, and also to deceive many of them with an idea that their numbers are greatly increasing, when there may be serious cause to fear that their* living members, *those who are actuated by a pure love to God, beyond every consideration of life, honour, reputation or gain; and are humbly looking for salvation only thro' the merits of a gracious Redeemer, are rather declining: that* these may become more numerous; *that they may deeply consider their high calling* as Christians; *the dangers consequent on any, as individuals or a body, conceiving themselves to stand on higher ground than others, is the sincere prayer of the editor. With these sentiments he recommends to their consideration the subjects embraced in the following excellent Letter, subjects which cannot but interest every Christian professor, and which of course he trusts will not be deemed obtrusive or offensive.*

July 1819.

A LETTER TO

WILLIAM PENN &c.

SIR,

I HAVE had this long time an intention to write to you; but having this more than ordinary fit opportunity of sending, I could now no longer forbear. It is to thank you for your visit at my lodging in Pauls Church yard, when I was last at London, though I had not the happiness then to be there; and for your kind intention of writing to me, and sending me some books; But that you did neither, I conceive, was because you might be afterward informed, that I had bought the very books that you intended to send me, (and it was an omission in Mr. Kettilby, that he did not inform you so at his shop) and so the occasion of writing ceasing, you forbore to write. Indeed meeting with the little Pamphlet of yours, newly come out, wherein some twenty and odd learned and reverend Divines are concerned, I had the curiosity to buy it and read it: and though I wish there were no occasion of these controversies and contests betwixt those that have left the Church of Rome; yet I found such a taste, both of wit

and seriousness in that pamphlet, and the argument it was about, to be so weighty, that I was resolved to buy all of J. Faldo's, and all of yours, touching that subject. But before that little pamphlet, I never met with any of your writings: but was the more encouraged to read them, when I met with them, by a question G. K.* put to me when he was with me at my chamber in Cambridge. For I taking the liberty of commending his *Immediate Revelation*, as the best book I had met with amongst the writings of the Quakers, he ingeniously and honestly asked me, didst thou never read any thing of Wm. Penn's? And I told him, I had not: and then he gave me that character of your writings that invited me to buy that pamphlet I mentioned above, so soon as I met with it in London. But presently after G. K. had left Cambridge, I had a strong instigation to read over again his *Immediate Revelation*, and made some remarks upon the first part of it; which hoping to see him again at Cambridge, at his return into Scotland, I intended to communicate to him; and spoke to W. B. on purpose to signifie to him, that I should be glad to see him at his return. But it seems he was gone back before W. B. was aware; and therefore I have sent those very remarks inclosed to you, hoping that you can convey them safe to him, with a letter I have writ to him. But upon these occasions is was, that I had prevented your intended kindness of sending me those books: I mean those two against John Faldo; and hold myself as much obliged for your good intention, as if you had done it.

And now that I have perused them, I cannot but say thus much; that I met with several excellent passages

* George Keith.

in them, that are very expressive of a vigorous resentment, and experience of what appertains to life and holiness: and that I exceedingly rejoice, that the Quakers have emerged above the low beginning of an heartless and hopeless Familism, that, quitting the expectation of a Glorious Immortality after this life, quitted also all dependance or relation to our Saviour's person as man, believing his soul as mortal as they do the rest, and that there is nothing surviving of him, but that light that was ever, and is common to all men, the eternal Word that lightens every man that cometh into the world. I must confess, that I have even an invincible suspicion (so far as I can see) that this was the first state of the Quakers at the beginning of their appearance: touching which, since I have said enough, for the present, in my remarks I have sent you, I shall give you no further trouble in this point. But being of this persuasion, you cannot imagine how much I was pleased with my converse with G. K. who so freely and declaredly affirmed to me, that he (and he put in the rest of the Quakers) did heartily believe the history of the Gospel in the literal sense thereof; as I find you also express therein, up and down in your books. And I am very glad, that the Quakers have thus far (since for the present we cannot get them into the Church) two such able and faithful guides, to keep them within the main verges of Christianity. And, I hope, according to the measure of their sincerity, the Quakers faith and practice will grow more ample and articulate, till they reach, at last, the full stature of Christ in the Primitive and Apostolick times. And

for the present, I must confess, that those charges that J. Faldo lays against them, though I do but little doubt but that they are all true against the Familists (from whence the Quakers may spring) yet the Quakers themselves (if they be all of the same mind with yourself and G. K.) are free from the most and chiefest of them; and therefore, so far as I can remember, (for I have not J. Faldo here by me) the main difference betwixt you and your antagonist, is about Baptism and the Lord's Supper; in which, I must ingeniously confess, you seem to me to have given the least satisfaction. Your main refuge, as I remember, is this; that neither Christ nor his Apostles instituted, nor appointed, either of those sacraments; though Christ celebrated indeed the Lord's supper with his Disciples, and the Apostles practised baptizing of believers; but neither are commanded or instituted by either.

But as for baptism, methinks there is an express institution of it, *Mark* 16. *ver.* 15, 16. *Go ye into all the World, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.* The institution of water baptism here is plainly implied; because less stress is laid upon it than in believing: for he that believeth not shall be damned: but he doth not say, he that is not baptised shall be damned. But if spiritual baptism were here looked upon merely and adequately, which is regeneration by the Spirit, he that is not baptized would be certainly damned: for he that has not the spirit of Christ is none of his. Nay, the very believing that Jesus is the Lord and Christ, implies the party to be baptized with the spirit already; because no man

can say, that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost: which is also answerable to the form of speech that calls baptism, *Lavacrum Regenerationis;* intimating what is implied in the baptism of the Spirit, is only our regeneration, by which we are enabled really and cordially to believe, and profess, that Jesus is the Lord and Christ; which no man can do but by the Holy Ghost; and therefore it is here said, he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: where if baptised were not water baptism, but the baptism of the Spirit, it were a tautology. Whence it is reasonable to conclude, that baptizing there is for a sign of their inward Baptism of the Holy Ghost, which they have partaken of, whereby they believe in the Lord Jesus: as also for a ceremony of their admission into the congregation of believers; accordingly as St. Peter argues, *Acts* 10. 47. *Can any one forbid water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?* Nor was it needful in the above cited place of Mark, that it should be said, he that believes and is baptized with water: because the very baptizing implies so much; that being the usual sense of the word with the Jews. Nor could our Saviour Christ but foresee, that the disciples would understand it so; which is a sign it was also his own meaning. And the disciples of John the baptist, (Joh. 3. 26.) *declare to him, how Jesus whom he bore witness to, baptized; and that all came to him*: which certainly was with water; and it was the ceremony of the professing themselves the disciples of Christ, as appears, *John* 4. 1. where Jesus is again said πλειονας μαθητὰς ποιειν ϗ βαπτίζειν, to make and baptize more disciples than John; which though it is said

there, he did it not in his own person: yet being he is said to do it, though he did it by others, it is plain that they did it by his institution or commission. And John does acknowledge to his own disciples, that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than he; and gives the reason of it, because he was the Messias, to whom the gathering of the people should be; but that himself was only the fore-runner of him, &c. It is plain therefore, that the making of disciples to Christ, and entring them into his flock by water baptism, is an institution of Christ. And from this passage of *John* 4. *ver.* 1. where Christ is said πλειονας μαθητας ποιειν & βαπτιζειν, to make and baptise more disciples than John, is most easily and naturally understood that precept Christ gives to his Apostles, *Mat.* 28 *Go therefore* μαθητευσατε (i. e.) μαθητας ποιειτε) *make disciples of all nations*; (now promiscuously, as you did of Jews only at first) *baptising them in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost*: but as you baptized them with water then, to bear my name, and to profess themselves my disciples; so now I enjoin the same sacrament or ceremony, but with a more explicit form; *in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost*: of the Father, the Creator and original of all; of the Son, that is the Messias, or the Christ of God, in whom the eternal Logos became man; and of the Holy Spirit, by whose illumination and Sanctification all true believers in the Messias, (by virtue of their regeneration through this spirit, which the Messias promised should perpetually assist his Church) become the sons of God. This is the profession that, by the external ceremony of water, all nations that were converted to Christ, were to be

baptized into; and I think no man will be so extravagant, as to think that this form of words was used without the ceremony of water baptism accompanying it. And there is no baptism now that is available to mankind, but this; namely, that one baptism that is into this one faith, and one Lord, the Christ of God the Father; who has promised all requisite aids of his Spirit to them that rightly believe in him. And in this regard it is said, there is but one baptism; because both the water baptism, and that of the Spirit signified thereby, terminate in this one point; that is, the profession of that one faith, and that one Lord, namely the Lord Christ, God and man; the soul and body of the Messias being united with the Logos, and so continuing as a gracious and powerful intercessor for his Church with the Father for ever, according as he has promised; behold I am with you to the end of the world.

But though this baptism be truly one, in one respect, and that a main one, as I have declared, yet it is not absurd in another sense to say, there are two; namely, that of the spirit and that of the water; Flaminis and Fluminis, as some have expressed it. And the author to the Hebrews seems to allude to some such thing *Chap.* 6. where he reckons amongst the first rudiments or principles of the christian religion, the doctrine of baptisms; this water baptism, and that of the Spirit; plainly acknowledged two in this sense, that one is exterior and elementary, the other Spiritual and interior: but they drive at one thing; as the sense of a word, and the sound of a word, though two things, are counted one, they reaching at one and the same mark.

But that the apostles might be the more able administrators of this concrete baptism (for any one can do the ceremony of water) Christ promised them, *within a few days he would baptise them with the Holy Ghost*, *Act.* 1. 4, 5. so potent an intercessor should they find him with the Father. And that this therefore should be the difference betwixt John's baptism and his; that his was mere water baptism in a manner; but the baptism to be administered by Christ's apostles and disciples, though the exterior was water, yet it should, to all believers, be accompanied with the baptism of the Spirit; which was accordingly in the apostles time, even to miraculous gifts of the Spirit. But that water baptism was also included in that command, *Mat.* 28. (besides those reasons above alledged) is methinks extremely manifest to any indifferent man, in that the apostles understood our Saviour in that sense; witness their practice. And that they should understand him amiss, even after they had received the Holy Ghost, is very reproachful to them, if not to the Holy Spirit they received.

To all which may be added, that the form of words in Matthew plainly imply, that baptism was to be an external sign of admission into the Church, and profession of the Author and Finisher of their faith; namely, Christ the Messias, the Son of God; in reference to whom; viz. this Son, the Father is mentioned: as also the Spirit; his illumination, sanctification, and consolation being promised by the Messias the Son of God, to all believers in him. And that baptism is a form of admission into the Church and profession of our faith in Christ the Son of God, is apparent from

Acts. 10. 48. and other places. But baptism being more particularly and especially into the name of Christ, there called Κύριος, it is to be noted; that those that would lay aside baptism, are such especially that would lay aside the person of Christ, as the Familists do; I mean such a person of Christ as includes the soul of the Messias in it, which the sadducism of the Familists cannot admit. Whence the averseness of the Quakers from baptism, which commemorates Christ the anointed of God, whereas it is improper for the mere Logos to be anointed, seems to me to be part of the reliques of Familism in them: else, methinks, the Quakers standing so much for the Spirit (in which they do well, and are highly to be commended for it) they should be in love with that excellent form of baptism, which does so plainly make one part of our profession of Christianity, a declaring of our faith in Christ for the promise of the Spirit; and the Almighty power thereof, for the destroying and mortifying all sin in us, and the renewing us into the glorious image of the Son of God: so that he that does not believe this, may seem in a manner to renounce his baptism. And therefore they let go a considerable advantage, to oblige men to that weighty point of our christian faith, and most effectual for the driving on that great design of promoting Life and Godliness in the world, by laying aside this form of baptism.

And now for the Lord's Supper; that it was instituted by Christ, and declared so to be by St. Paul, as well as the Evangelists Matthew, Mark, Luke, is evident out of the Scripture: for *Matth.* 26. *ver.* 26, 27, 28. there Christ is said *to break bread, and to give it*

to the disciples, and to say; take eat, this is my body: And to take the cup and to say; drink you all of it, for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins. And again, *Mark* 14. 24. he there calls the cup *his blood of the New Testament which is shed for many.* And the same in *Luke* 22. 19. *this is my body which is given for you*: and ver. 20. *This cup is the New Testament in my blood which is shed for you;* where in the former verse touching the breaking of bread, he adds, *this do in remembrance of me.* And lastly *St. Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 11. it is observable, that he commends the Corinthians (In the beginning of the chapter) for keeping the Ordinances as he had delivered them to them, τὰς παραδόσεις καθὼς παρέδωκεν αὐτοῖς; of which, it is plain, the celebrating of the Lords Supper is one: *ver.* 23. *For I have received of the Lord, what also I delivered to you* ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν: which παράδοσις ordinance or tradition, is this of celebrating the Lords Supper. And he says, he received this ordinance or tradition from the Lord himself; *that bread is to be broken and eaten*, as a sign of the body of Christ broken for us on the cross *ver.* 24. And that we are to do this in remembrance of him, that was thus bruised for our transgressions. And *ver.* 25. the like he says of the *cup, that it is the New Testament (or New Covenant) in his blood*; which he exhorts, as often as believers drink of, *that they would do it in remembrance of him*, whose blood was shed. For *ver.* 26. This is the end of celebrating the Lords Supper; that we may thereby annunciate to ourselves, and all the world, the endearing sufferings of our ever blessed Sa-

viour (as the Apostle intimates) never antiquating it, till he come again, and appear in glory at the last day; not in the form of a sinful malefactor on the cross, but as the glorious Judge of the Quick and the dead (as the Apostles creed professes) which is the most famous second coming of Christ, and most celebrated in the Church: and to which I do not at all doubt but that of *Acts* 1. 11. alludes; *This same Jesus which is taken up from you into Heaven, shall so come in like manner, as ye have seen him go into Heaven*; that is, he shall come with a visible, personal appearance, and with power, and great glory. And that also of *Hebrews* 9. 28. makes to this purpose; *So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many* (which oblation and passion of his we celebrate in the Lord's Supper) *and to them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin, unto salvation*: that is to say; not in the form of sinful flesh, being made sin for us who knew no sin (that is, being made חטאת, sin or a sin offering) but he will come as a glorious Judge of the Quick and the Dead; and will then prove a Saviour to the utmost, *changing our vile bodies into the similitude of his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself, Phil.* 3. 20. 21.

Now from all these places of scripture methinks, it is manifest, that the celebrating the Lords Supper, is an institution from Christ himself: He intimating such reasons of it as are permanent, and continue so long as Christ shall have a Church upon earth. For he saying, *Mat.* 26. *Drink you all of this; for this is my*

blood of the New Testament (or New Covenant) which is shed for many, for the remission of sins: this blood of Christ being still in force for remission of sins; there remains still the same reason for celebrating so great a benefit. And the same may be said of that same passage in *Mark*. And besides, in Luke *Ch. 22.* it is said, *this is my body which is given for you* (namely, as a propitiatory sacrifice on the cross) and straightway is added, *this do in remembrance of me*: that is, of me who gave my body a sacrifice for you, to propitiate the wrath of God, and procure remission of sins. And can this be a transient consideration; and not continue as long as the Church? And remembrance is of things past, not of things present; so that there is not the least pretence of laying aside the Lord's Supper; it being a celebrating the endearing passion of Christ past on the Cross. And lastly, that of *St. Paul*, **1** *Cor.* **11.** where he having commended the Corinthians for keeping the ordinances (or traditions) delivered to them by him; anon he mentions this ordinance of the Lord's Supper, which he declares, *he received from the Lord;* which therefore must needs be obligatory to them, and to all succeeding generations after them. And the very form of words implies so much; *this is my body which was broken for you* (namely, upon the cross) *this do in remembrance of me*; that is, of me that was crucified: And so of the cup, *this cup is the New Covenant in my blood*; and be sure you never forget it is so, whenever you drink thereof: but be mindful of me, who shed my blood for you, that is, died for you, according as the Apostle interprets it, *ver. 26. For as often as ye*

eat this bread and drink this cup, καταγγέλλετε, *you carry down the commemoration of the death of the Lord till his second coming*: to be understood out of the first of the Acts, and the ninth of the Hebrews above mentioned. Certainly any one freed from all prejudice, and pre-possession of opinion, will easily acknowledge this to be the natural sense of these places touching the Lord's Supper; and that the institution thereof is grounded upon reasons immutable so long as Christ has a Church upon earth. For the ground of the institution is the passion of Christ on the cross at Jerusalem. This alone is mentioned in the institution itself; and this we are commanded to commemorate, more than once or twice, in the forecited Scriptures. And this is of huge importance, for the exciting of our love to Christ, and sincere kindness one to another: nothing more useful in all the gospel; and therefore nothing less abrogable. For the express ground, alledged by Christ himself in the Evangelists, and by St. Paul from Christ, in his epistle to the Corinthians, of celebrating the Lord's Supper, is not that it may be a type of the body and blood of Christ, in that sense Christ speaks of, *John* 6. but that it may be a commemoration of his passion on the cross, and of that endearing love he showed to us therein, in suffering so shameful and painful a death for us: that we may thereby be even enforced by an ingenuous sense of gratitude, to be content to mortify our own lusts, be it never so painful; and to adhere to our blessed Saviour by an unfeigned love, and also to one another according as he himself hath intimated, *John* 15. *Greater love hath no*

man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you: and this is my commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you. I do in no wise deny, but that there is another mystery also included in the Lord's Supper, which takes in the body and blood of Christ in that sense Christ speaks of, *John* 6. that the bread and wine are also types of the celestial Manna, the divine body of Christ, and his Spirit; as I have more largely described in my remarks on G. K's book: which also the office of the communion in our Church Liturgy, with great piety and judgment, takes in; which intimates such a Spiritual participating of the body and blood of Christ, that we thereby *dwell in Christ and Christ in us; that we be one with Christ and Christ with us.* But it is in the meantime abundantly evident, that the ground and reason of the institution of the Lord's Supper, specified by Christ himself at the institution thereof, is the celebrating his passion: and therefore that ground still remaining; and besides, an institution of Christ being abrogable by no power less than Divine; it is evident, that the celebrating the Lord's Supper is not to be laid aside, under pretence that we have arrived to that which in one sense is signified by the bread and wine, viz. the divine body and spirit of Christ. For besides that it is not at all absurd, that the sign and the thing signified may continue together, (as the Rainbow and the assurance of God's promise *he will never again destroy the earth by water*) that other ground, upon which alone the Lord's Supper was instituted, still remains entire. Not to add that which I noted above, touching baptism, that Peter's ar-

guing was this; that because believers have attained the thing, therefore they should also receive the sign, even water baptism.

And lastly, whereas it is alledged, that we are not to celebrate the Lord's Supper in those outward elements of bread and wine any longer than till he come; namely in the Spirit: here I demand, what authority any one has to make such an exposition, which is so groundless and unwarrantable. For it is against all reason to interpret it of any other coming of Christ, but such as was notoriously known and received in the Church from the Apostles time to this very day; and of which, amongst other places, those two above cited, *Acts* 1. *and Heb.* 9. do witness. But for his coming in the Spirit, it has been always, to all true believers, ever since he left it; and with whom he has kept his promises, as being the faithful Amen that cannot lie. He has, I say, ever sent his Spirit to them to mortifie, to sanctifie, to regenerate, to comfort and guide them throughout their life. But if this will be put off, by saying it was not in that measure as is hoped for, and experienced by some in this age; even to this it may be also said, that they obtain this measure but by degrees, and must have time to grow to the highest; and in the meantime, at least the obligation, upon their own concessions, will lie upon them to celebrate the Lord's Supper in outward bread and wine; and being there will be always in the Church children as well as old men, this custom, even upon their own grounds, must never cease in the Church forever. Besides that (whatever becomes of their grounds) the grounds our Saviour himself instituted it upon, remain unshaken and unalterable.

Wherefore, if I may speak freely without offence, what I verily conceive to be true; this omission of the Lord's Supper by the Quakers, is part of that smut of Familism that still lies upon them. For the coming of Christ in the Spirit, with the Familists, is nothing else but a trick of infidelity, as touching the personal offices of the soul of the Messias, which they think has perished with his body, as they fancy of all mens souls else: and so being driven to Hobson's choice (if I may use so mean a proverb in so high a matter) they must either profess a coming of Christ according to the Spirit, inward only, or no Christ at all. And therefore, they labour hugely to bring back their religion beyond the incarnation of Christ, and make it as old as Abraham or Adam himself: they acknowledging no other Christ than what ever did and ever will enlighten every man that comes into the world: which cannot be understood of the soul of the Messias, whose incarnation, passion, resurrection, &c. is the rise and epocha of the Christian religion; the renewal whereof is the coming of Christ in the Spirit to them, and their acknowledging merely the eternal Logos for Christ, which yet is a contradiction in the very terms. For the eternal Logos is not the Annointed, as Christ signifies, but the Annointer; he that imparts to us the unction of the Holy Spirit, that teaches us all things. But it is this Logos, in conjunction with the divine soul of the Messias, incarnate of the Virgin Mary, &c. that is the special object of our christian faith; and which all must believe, that believe the history of the Gospel; which the Familists do not, and so quit all relation or dependance on the person of Christ, in the orthodox sense, and wholly boast of the

coming of him in Spirit, out of a spirit of infidelity underneath. But the Quakers, through the goodness of God, having emerged to a greater and more sound measure of faith, wrong themselves in retaining such things as are more natural appendages to Familism, than to their own present state, and more pure christian profession.

But because so great stress is laid upon that passage of *John ver.* 9. *The light that lightens every one that comes into the world*; which seeming to denote the eternal Logos only, bears the mind of the Familists, and too many of the Quakers too, I fear, so high that they over-look the noble soul of the Messias, as no part of the object of their faith; I will briefly here intimate what I conceive to be the genuine sense of the first part of that chapter, to the 14th verse; such as was suggested to me one night after the reading one of your books, having taken up my Greek testament and impartially perusing this former part of this first chapter a little before I went to bed; if haply there be any thing awaked on your spirit, that will close with what was so clearly and assuredly suggested to mine, which I will briefly hint to you, according to the order of the verses.

The Evangelist therefore having in his mind the divinity of Christ, as well as his humanity, begins with that first; and in the four first verses describes the Trinity of the Godhead under these three appellations of ὁ θεός, ὁ λόγος, and ἡ ζωὴ: which answers to what occurs in his general Epistle where he says, *there are three that bear record in Heaven*, ὁ πατὴρ, ὁ λόγος, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, *the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost:*

τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα there answering to ἡ ζωὴ here in the Gospel. And indeed it always seemed strange to me, that the Spirit was not here mentioned as well as the word. But here it occurs under the name of ἡ Ζωή. If it had been ψυχή, Amelias the Platonist might have had more evident occasion of that high asseveration of his, *per Jovem Barbarus iste cum nostro platone sentit;* and of fancying the mystery borrowed from him. But to show he had it from an higher and more divine fountain, the Evangelist puts in the third place, ἡ ζωή, not ψυχή; which is by far the more true and proper expression for that which is ordinarily called the third Hypostasis; ψυχή implying a body to actuate, but not ζωή; and therefore ζωὴ may be eternal but not ψυχὴ and is elsewere called the eternal Spirit. But this my intended brevity will not suffer me to insist upon. In the mean time it is manifest, that ἡ ζωή, or the Life, is the same as the Holy Ghost. And thus far of the Deity, as in itself. But in the latter part of the 4th verse, is briefly and in general declared, that this Holy Ghost was, and is τὸ φῶς τῶν ανθρώπων, that eminent Light (or illumination) of singular and excellent men (for so τὸ and τῶν will by easy criticism imply, those articles being used ordinarily to signify eminency) in all ages and places of the world; according as is declared thereof in the book of Wisdom, *Chap.* 7. 22. for wisdom, there described, the ancient Fathers understand of the Logos, or divinity of Christ: and in her there is said to be φιλάνθρωπον πνεῦμα (as here εν αυτῳ ἡ ζωή) which *in all ages entring into Holy Souls, makes them friends of God,*

and prophets, *ver.* 23 *and* 27. These singularly illuminated souls therefore become the lights of their respective ages and countries; and are called lights: as Christ told his disciples, *they were the light of the world*: and he says, *John the Baptist was a burning and a shining light.* And thus the mind of the Evangelist being engaged in the consideration of concrete light (as I may so speak) that is, of noble illuminated souls that have come into this world; he presently fixes on the most eminent example, namely the soul of the Messias come into the flesh, that most illustrious Light promised of God to come in time, and declared by Simeon to be the Light to lighten the Gentiles, and to be the glory of the people of Israel. Upon this eminent Light therefore the Evangelist fixing his mind, considers with himself the suscess of his appearing; and therefore declares in the fifth verse, that this eximious concrete light (namely, the soul of the Messias come in the flesh) that this light shines in darkness (still present by the history of his life, and personally present before his death) but the darkness comprehended it not; i. e. few acknowledged him to be what he was; insomuch that he wanted the testimony of John the Baptist, to awaken their slowness of belief. Nay, some of them were more inclined to think John the Baptist might be the Messias rather than he, as appears from *ver.* 19. 20; 21.

That this is the genuine sense of this *5th verse*, is manifest from the *6th 7th* and *8th verses*; where it is plain, that John the Baptist is not compared with the eternal Logos, but with the visible person of Christ. *He was not that Light, but he was to bear witness of*

that Light: as he does *ver.* 20. and apertly tells the messengers *that he was not the Messias, but that Jesus was he, ver.* 27. Wherefore it is a plain case, that the soul of the Messias come in the flesh is the Light mentioned in the fifth verse: and there is no question in the world, but that it is the same Light that is mentioned in the ninth verse, because the light mentioned in the fifth and ninth verses, is the same that is mentioned in the eighth; which light, being compared with John the baptist, must be Jesus the Messias.

This came into my mind with that clearness and conviction, that I could not resist it; though I was otherwise prejudiced against it by our English translation and many other translations; and by my own use of this place (either in private letters or my publick writings) in a sense that concerned the Logos, not that complex of the Logos and the soul of the Messias together. And therefore looking upon the Greek Testament, I easily found the genuine and most proper and chief sense, and such as is coherent with the context both foregoing and following, to be this Johns competitor; namely, Jesus the Messias, upon whom the Evangelist had so specially fix'd his mind: he was the true Light, who being come into the world enlightens every man; as well Gentile as Jew, according as Simeon declares, moved by the Holy Ghost; that the child Jesus was to be a light to lighten the Gentiles, as well as the glory of the people of Israel. The gramatical consideration of this text will bear this sense with all imaginable easiness; and the coherence of things necessarily requires it.

And hitherto Christ is described but only as the most

eminent Prophet that ever came into the world; *that Prophet that the Lord their God should raise amongst the Jews, Acts* 3. 22.

But the five following verses are of an higher strain; and give witness to his Divinity, that he is Θεάνθρωπος, God as well as man. Else how could the world be made by him, as it is said to be, *ver.* 10. even *that world that knew him not.* And his *coming to his own, ver.* 11. may imply his special superintendency over the Jews before he took flesh. But then, *ver.* 12. 13. *that as many* (of the Jews or others) *as received him,* he should give them the opportunity and *power of becoming the sons of God*; by recovering the divine nativity, and being born again of the incorruptible seed of the body and blood of the Son of God (of which he speaks, *John* 6.) that is, to be born of the divine Body, and to be enlivened of the ζωὴ of the Logos, or eternal Spirit, which perfects regeneration to the souls of the faithful, by operating on the divine Matter, which it unites to the Soul, and actuates the soul through it, as the spirit of nature perfects natural generations, working on the common matter of the Universe: this is a power attributed to Christ, or the Messias; so great towards them that believe in him, that it must needs imply his divinity also. And therefore it coherently follows, *ver.* 14. Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο. *For the word was made flesh* (for καὶ will easily signifie for) that is there being that strict union betwixt the soul of the Messias and the Logos, the soul of the Messias taking flesh, the Logos is said to be incarnate also: though I will not trouble you with scholastick terms to express it, nor tire you out with any further enlargement on this

matter. You will easily perfect the rest yourself, if you can close with the main that I have hinted.

In the mean time, it is very clear to me; that that true Light mentioned, *ver.* 9. is not (in the chief sense, and that which will be coherent with the context) to be understood of the mere Logos; but of the soul of the Messias incarnate, and visible person of Christ: who being man as well as God, must have an human soul as well as a body, to be united to the Logos; which soul being still in being, and in union with the Logos, as also with its own glorious body, is our great High Priest and Intercessor for his Church with the Father, in the Heavens, forever: and that the Christian religion, properly so called, doth not loosen itself into so general and lax tenure as belongs to the time before Christ as well as after; but is circumscribed and bounded by the appearance of the soul of the Messias in the flesh. Nor doth the Logos enlighten every man that comes into the world, otherwise than by having given them a natural conscience: which talent, if it be well used, then the ζωὴ, or eternal Spirit, or Holy Ghost (as St. John calls it in his epistle) may further illuminate them. But this is the τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, that supereminent Light of singularly excellent men in whatever ages of the world; a gift common to all true believers in Christ, accordingly as he has promised; *that he that believeth on him, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water, John* 7. but that every reproof of conscience for evil, or motion to good, is the operation of the light of the Logos, superadded to the light of natural conscience, this *9th ver. of John* 1. affords no

countenance to such a mistake in either theology or philosophy: nor yet to overlook the human nature of Christ, by pretending that every man is enlightened immediately by the Divine Logos; which were all one as to affirm, that every one is inspired by the Holy Ghost: but the right apostolick faith is not encumbered with any such needless paradoxes.

But the main thing of all that I would drive at, is this; that the soul of the Messias united with the Logos, become incarnate, or appearing in the flesh, is that super-eminent and true light mentioned in *9th verse of the first of St. John's Gospel*: and is that universal Light intended for all the world, Jew and Gentile, to be gathered to: who can no otherwise be a light in this sense, but by virtue of the records and history of his life and doctrine, and of the lives and doctrines of his Apostles; whom he promised to be with, and to guide into all truth, by his intercession with God the Father, and the mission of the Holy Ghost. That this Christ above described, is so super-eminent and universal a Light, and such as all the world, as they have opportunity, ought to look after, is manifest even to the mere natural man, upon the evidence of the history; That this man Jesus was born of a virgin, did stupendous miracles in his life, rose from the dead after he was crucified, ascended into Heaven visibly in the sight of the disciples; and by his intercession with God the Father, poured upon his Disciples according to his promise, in a miraculous manner, the gift of the Holy Ghost. Wherefore even the mere natural and unregenerate man is convincible from hence, that Jesus is a worthy and safe guide to follow; as being so eminent a messenger

sent from God: of which there is this notable usefulness; that those holy and heavenly precepts of our Saviour, which are even contrary to the natural man, (as self-denial, the unfeigned love of our enemies. and the like) though he have no inward principle in him that can close with these, as convinced of the loveliness of them in themselves; yet by his common natural reason he is so convinced of the excellency of Christs person, and that we ought to follow the commands and guidance of so excellent a teacher, and infallibly inspired of God, that he finds himself obliged to obey these commandments as near as he can; that is, to abstain for the present (he being able to go no further) from the acts of revenge on his enemies, and from satisfying other apetites that are so strong, and so dear to flesh and blood; though the lusts themselves of pride, concupiscence, and revenge, still remain, and the external obligation to the contrary as strongly urging. And thus being at a loss in himself, Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to day and forever (that is, for ever able and ready to procure the aid of the Holy Spirit to all that call upon God in his name) if he call upon God the Father in faith and sincerity, in the name of his Son the Lord Jesus Christ, for the assistance of the Holy Spirit to strengthen him against all the assaults of sin, to mortify and eradicate all inordinate lusts, and to regenerate his soul into the living image of righteousness and true holiness; our blessed Saviour that cannot lie, *he* has promised, that he will procure it for him. *If ye shall ask any thing in my name, I will do it, John* 14. And it is the very sense of our baptism; which is the profession of our belief in Jesus Christ the Son of God, from whom he procures the

assistance of the Holy Spirit to all them that believe on him.

But in the mean time it is very manifest, of what use the doctrines of Christ and his Apostles are; and what obligation they ought to have on us, even before we reach the sense of their innate worthiness and loveliness by a principle of life within, upon the mere external command of so divine and infallible a teacher as our Saviour. For there are three degrees of the divine law taking hold upon us, and obliging.

One is external conviction, when we are indeed convinced, we ought to follow such a command; but it is only upon exterior considerations; that is, from the excellency and infallibility of the person that commands it, and the fear of punishment or hope of reward, which is compatible even to natural men and unregenerate.

The second is internal conviction; when we arrive to a discovery that there is an innate worthiness, loveliness, and reasonableness in the commands of Christ; but yet this conviction is more imaginary and rational, than substantial and vital; but is accompanied, it may be, with some rudiments of real regeneration.

But the third is not only internal conviction, that we ought to do, or be so and so, as being the most perfect and lovely state; but that we find it to be our natural joy and pleasure, and the very life of our soul and fullest content of our heart, to be and do as our Saviour has prescribed unto us: which is the condition of an higher advance in real regeneration; when the spirit of holiness is to us what our natural spirit was, and we are made partakers, to this degree of the divine nature.

But in all these degrees it is manifest, that the con-

viction and obligation lie upon us; and that the Scripture is both obligatory and useful to us, even in our first state, before experience and real regeneration: Which I thought worth the taking notice of; because, if I mistake not, some of the Quakers seem to speak to the contrary, and so dishearten men from reading the scripture, till they be that already that the scripture drives at, if it be not a relick of the Familists, who are as afraid of their novices medling with scripture, till they be soundly tinctured with the principles of their sect, as the Romanists are. And indeed the impartial sense of the scripture is even as much repugnant to the one as the other; which makes them both conspire in the use of the same artifice.

These few things were suggested to me upon my reading of your books against J. Faldo. But since I came hither to Ragley, I had the opportunity of looking again into your *no Cross no Crown*: which I look upon as a serious book, and very pious and christian in the main; yet I question how consistent it is, in some points, with that generosity, and freedom, and charity, and kind complacency, that one would think did naturally accompany a truly christian Spirit. The great and royal Law, which is to measure all our christian actions by, is; *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and all thy soul; and thy neighbour as thyself.* And one point of our love to our neighbour is, not to give him offence; but to comply with him in things of an indifferent nature; as all things are, that are not of their own nature evil, (and such are all those things that are what they are, or signify what they signify, by use and custom, and not by nature) unless some

divine law, or the law of our superiors, has bound us? But no law, neither divine nor human, has bound us, but that we may say *you*, when the Quakers say *thou*, to a single person. Nay, custom, which is another nature and another law, and from whence words derive their signification, has not only made *you* to signify as well singularly as plurally (as the verb love doth, in I love, and we love; when as the Latins say, *ego amo*, *nos amamus*) but has superadded a signification of a moderate respect used in the singular sense; as it has added to *thou*, of the highest respect and reverence (for no man will *you* God, but use the pronoun *thou* to him) or else of the greatest familiarity or contempt. So that the proper use of *you* and *thou* is settled by a long and universal custom. And words signifying nothing of themselves, but as custom makes them (whence *scripsimus* and *canimus*, or the like, usually signify no more in latin writers, than *scripsi* and *cano*; and the very Greek grammar explains ἐι ἀμφὶ Σωκράτει, i. e. *Socrates*) there is not only no intrinsick evil in the using them in that sense custom has put upon them; but a great deal of christian kindness and charity in taking heed how we give unnecessary offence to our neighbour, by using such a word as use has made significative of over-much familiarity or contempt; which would be like the calling of a person of honesty and quality knave, because knave at first had no reproachful signification. This short hint is enough for a business of this nature.

And now for Cap-honour and Titular respects. The not complying in these things moderately and unaffec-

tedly, methinks is less Christian. If the apostles could comply with the Jews in some Mosaical rites, that the coming of Christ had abrogated, that they might give no offence to the Jews; how much more ought christians, for the avoiding of offence, comply with one another in such customs as no law, neither human nor divine, has yet abrogated? And such is Cap-honour and Titular respects.

For the first is but a thetical or customary expression (and therefore of a nature indifferent) of that respect we bear to creatures of our own mould and shape; whose blood, as it is not to be shed; so their persons are not to be slighted but to be respected: *For in the image of God made he man*, *Gen.* 9. 6. and as the Turks bow to one another, so we put off our hats; but they both signify the same thing, a kind inclination and readiness to serve one another.

And as for titles; they are usually significative of either offices, or orders, and dignities in a kingdom: and if there be these distinctions of orders and dignities in a body politick, why may there not be names to them? And if they have names, why may they not be called by them; and it is as natural in a body politick, that there should be different ranks and orders of men, as in the natural there should be of members. So that the slighting all these things must needs be a riddle to the sober. It is not a thing long to be insisted upon: and yet I cannot omit to speak something of the places you alledge for the practice of the Quakers. The chief are, *Mat.* 23. *v.* 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. *John* 5. 44. *James* 3. 1. which are alledged under reason XIII.

To that of Matthew I answer; the *5th* *6th* and *7th*

verses are no declaration against titles, or orders, and precedency; but against the being of so vain and proud a mind, as to please themselves in them, and affect them; which is a sign of a vain, empty spirit. In which sense also the 8*th* verse is to be understood; *but be not ye called rabbi*; that is, do not affect that title and pride yourselves in it, as the Scribes and Pharisees did. But this is not against the calling others Rabbi, Master, or Doctor; but the being so called ourselves. And the words following in this verse, which gives the reason of the precept, plainly insinuate that to be the sense; for one is your master; or you have one only, master, καθηγητὴς, teacher or guide, and that is Christ, and you are all brethren, that is fellow followers, or disciples of his according as St. Paul expresseth himself; *be ye followers of me, as I am of Christ*; so far and no farther. Which therefore seem a prophetical caution against those infalliable dictators of new forged articles and useless forms and opinions, which Christ foresaw would sometimes be brought into the Church, by them that would pretend to have power to obtrude upon every conscience such things as are not the teachings of Christ and his gospel; but against express scripture, and the indelible notions of truth, that Christ the eternal Logos has implanted in the souls of all men. Which prophetical caution is further carried on in the very next verse, *ver.* 9. *and call no man Father upon earth*; which cannot be understood of father in a civil or natural sense, (for then it would not be lawful for a son to call his father, father) but that no Christian is to admit any one so to be his Spiritual father, as to give belief to him, or obey him, in such instructions and com-

mands as are contrary to the instructions and commands of our Heavenly Father, *the Father of lights, and giver of every good and perfect gift.* Nothing is more frequent in the mouths of the Romish Laity to their priests and confessors, than *Mon Pere*, my Father; who under pretence of this reverend title, are blindly led by them into all superstition and idolatry, and are hindred from seeking the truth. And indeed the whole christian world, in a manner, is oppressed and prejudiced by a superstitious awe from the names and opinions of several ancient writers, that have got the titles of Fathers; whose authority must stop mens mouths, and obstruct their free enquiry into truth, and our assent to it, evidenced by the clearest reason and scripture, if any determination of these fathers seem to contradict it. But here we are forbid by our Saviour Christ, in this sense, to call any one father upon earth; and to give no ear to their instructions and commands, further than they agree with the mind and will of our Heavenly Father revealed to us by his Son Jesus Christ. The 10*th* verse is very like the 8*th* verse. But καθηγητής, answering to Rabbi in the 8*th* verse, and Rabbi signifying as well Magnus as Doctor or Magister; that it may not seem a tautology, this is a prophetical caution against the affected grandeur and princeliness that Christ foresaw would in time be affected in the Church (wherein the ordinary slight civility of calling Mr. such a one, and Mrs. such a one, I conceive, is little concerned) intimating there ought to be no dignities in the Church, but such as imply an office correspondently onorous and laborious: which is imply'd in the 11*th* verse; that he that ascends the highest in these dignities, if he have them upon the

due terms he ought to have them, he will thereby become the greatest servant, and have the most laborious task of all. And the *12th* is a prophesy of the downfal of the man of sin, who has so many years endeavoured only the magnifying himself, and exalting himself, but not the kingdom of the Lord Jesus.

To *John* 5. 44. *How can ye believe, that receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour that cometh from God only?* To this I answer, that this concerns not cap honour and titular respects; but the esteem and opinion they had of one another, whereby they were bolster'd up against the testimonies and witnessings of Christ: they would not confess Christ, nor entertain him, *because they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God*, *John* 12. 43.

As for that of *James* 3. 1. *My brethren, be not many masters, knowing that we shall receive the greater condemnation.* The greek has it, μὴ πολλοὶ διδάσκαλοι γίνεσθε, *be not many teachers*: what does this therefore respect, either cap-honour, or titular respect? But 'tis a sober monition, that men should not out of a rash self conceit take upon them to be teachers of others, before they be fit for such an employment. For in many things, says he, πταίομεν ἅπαντες, we all offend, (or stumble like men in the dark) and he's a perfect man indeed that trips not in his tongue: and so he goes on discoursing of that instrument, showing what dangerous use there is of it, in setting all on fire, in schism and dissention in the Church; and concludes with an encomium of that wisdom which is from above, that makes an able teacher; that it is first pure, then peaceable, &c.

Those scriptures alledged under reason XIV, and

XV. are these, 2 *Sam.* 14. 14. *Acts* 10. 35. *Eph.* 6. 9. *Col.* 3. 25. *James* 2. *ver.* 1, 2, *to the* 11*th verse. Job* 32. 22. *Revel.* 22. 8, 9.

To the four first of these, there can be nothing concluded; but that God is no respecter of persons, but rewards every one according to his work. But that he calls none by their titles, or commands us so, is not true: For in one place he says, *I said ye are Gods;* which is an high title: and the word of the Lord to Jeremie is, *chap.* 13. 18. *say unto the King and to the Queen.* But your most material place is that of *James* 2. but yet, nor does that reach the present controversy. For it is not against Cap-honour, which the rich ordinarily do to the poor, as well as the poor to the rich; nor against Titular respect; but against an unrighteous valuing and prefering a gaily deck,d unbeliever, and that in an holy assembly (εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ὑμῶν) before a poor brother rich in faith. This is that προσωποληψία condemned in verse 9*th*; that they will so industriously, and with such a deal of do, disturb the congregation, for the preferring a man with gay apparel and a gold ring on his finger, before a poor brother rich in faith, and an heir of the kingdom of Heaven; and that in the time of holy worship, or of their holy assembly, where the poor man, rich in faith, hath so much the pre-eminence before him with the gold ring and gay apparel. But abroad, and in civil affairs, the case will be altered, if his civil quality answer to his clothes. This intimation shall suffice for that of *St. James.* And as for *Job* 32. 22. *For I know not to give flattering titles, in so doing my Maker would soon take me away;* it is evident by the following chapter, that flattering titles are not there

the titles of Master, Sir, and the like; but the titles of Just, of Innocent; they are what Elihu, out of conscience, could not give to Job; as appears, *ver* 12. *behold in this thou art not just*, &c. And lastly, as for *Rev.* 22. it is manifest, it little concerns Hat-honour and Titular respects. For it was so profound a prostration of himself which John was about, and so near approaching to divine worship, and that height of humble affection which we owe to God only, that the Angel espying it in John's countenance, forbade him to go on in that intended worship, more fit for God than any creature; and therefore he adds, worship thou God. But what is this to hat honour and titular respects, calling Sir, or Mr. and the like, and moving the hat decently and unaffectedly?

Wherefore, I conceive, there is no ground in scripture (as I am certain there is not in reason) for this scrupulosity in the Quakers about hat-honour and titular respects; though they may conscientiously behave themselves as they do, out of ignorance and mistake: being, as I do vehemently suspect, abused into it at the first, by some enemies to the reformation, to make the upshot of it look as ugly and unpleasant as they could: which I will forbear to speak of here, having intimated enough in my remarks on G. K's *Immediate Revelation*, which I send you.

But as for the rest of your *no Cross no Crown*, it is, in the main, very sober and good; though it may be over-strict in some things, but not unuseful to some sort of men. But to those that are sincere, Christ and the written gospel will be their faithful guides in all things.

And as for your other two books against J. Faldo; whatever passages there be that may not be agreeable

to my sentiments, you will easily perceive of what nature they are, by perusing my remarks upon G. K's *immediate Revelation*. But there are sundry passages, in those two books of yours, very nobly christian ; and for which I have no small kindness and esteem for you, they being testimonies of that which I cannot but highly prize wherever I find it. And I wish the Quakers would disincumber those excellent things they profess, and give witness to, from such things as make them seem so uncouth and ridiculous : that the most excellent things of the gospel be not slighted, condemned or suspected by men, through the oddness and indiscretion of such as seem the most zealous professors of them. This intimation is not altogether unlike that of Paul to Timothy ; *Let as many servants as are under the yoke, count their masters worthy of all honour, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed* : which monition of the Apostle by analogy will reach a great way ; and one of your sincerity and parts will easily improve it.

I have nothing more for the present to add ; but that the trouble I have given both you and myself, in writing this letter, is from mere kindness and good will ; and that I hope you will take it so : and therefore committing you to God, and the gracious guidance of the Spirit of his Son, the Lord Jesus Christ ; I take leave and rest,

Your affectionate Friend

to serve you,

H. M.

A LETTER

TO

WILLIAM PENN Esq.

CONCERNING

BAPTISM AND THE LORDS SUPPER,

AND SOME

USAGES OF THE QUAKERS;

BY THE LEARNED AND PIOUS

HENRY MOORE D. D.

FIRST PUBLISHED IN LONDON, A. D. 1710

PHILADELPHIA,

REPUBLISHED BY S. POTTER & Co.

No. 55 CHESNUT STREET, SOLD ALSO BY T. & J. SWORDS NEW-YORK, & E. J. COALE BALTIMORE.

1819.

S. POTTER & CO.

HAVE LATELY PUBLISHED AND FOR SALE,

BEAN'S FAMILY WORSHIP,

A course of Morning & Evening Prayers, for every day in the month; to which is prefixed,

A DISCOURSE ON FAMILY RELIGION.

First American, from twelfth and last London Edition.

TRIAL OF EPISCOPACY,

Reported by R. C. C. A. M.

CANONS FOR THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH

IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Being the substance of various Canons adopted in General Conventions of said Church, from the year of our Lord 1789, to the year 1817 inclusive; to which are added the constitution of the Church, &c. &c.

A COMMON PLACE BOOK,

Upon the Plan recommended and practised by

JOHN LOCKE, FSQ.

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: April 2006

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

BX 7731

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 014 238 862 5